K with preceding

Mr. *ROBE*'s

Second LETTER

To the Reverend

Mr. JAMES FISHER

Minister of the Gospel in the Associate Congregation at *Glasgow*;

CONCERNING

His REVIEW of the *Preface* to a *Narrative* of the extraordinary Work at *Kilsyth*, &c.

WHEREIN

Mr. *Edwards*' Sermon, upon the *distinguishing Marks of a Work of the Spirit of GOD*, is vindicated from Mr. *Fisher*'s Objections against it in the said *Review*.

Mendacium est tenue, si diligenter inspexeris pellucet.
Seneca.

Mordear opprobriis falsis, mutemque colores?
Falsus honor juvat, & Mendax infamia terret,
Quem, nisi Mendosum & Mendacem?
Horat. Epist. 16. Lib. 1.

EDINBURGH,
Printed by *T. Lumisden* and *J. Robertson*, and sold by *J. Traill* at his Shop in the *Parliament-close*. 1743.

Dear Brother,

IN my *first Letter* to you, the Mistakes in your *Review* have, as I apprehend, been evidently laid open to Page 10. where you begin to attack Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon upon the *distinguishing Marks of a Work of the Spirit of God.*— This my *second* proceeds from the same friendly Disposition both to Truth and You, to vindicate this judicious and excellent Sermon from the heavy, but badly supported, Charge you have brought against it.— It is the Property of Charity, never to impute Evil rashly to any Man; it interpreteth doubtful Things in the best Sense; it never places our Neighbour's Actions and Words in a wrong Light. How contrary is it then to this heavenly Grace, by wresting, perverting and breaking Mens Words, to put a bad Meaning upon them, of which they are not capable? Thus, however, you have dealt by the Reverend Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon; of which I desire and hope to make you sensible.

It is very true, Messieurs *Willison*, *Webster* and I assert, That Mr. *Edwards*, in the foresaid Sermon, hath answered several of the same Objections that have been made against this Work, tho' not in the Terms you use.— This Performance is extolled, not only (according to you) by the Promoters of this Work, but by all unprejudised and intelligent Persons.— What you say of the Reverend Mr. *Willison's* recommending it, in a Preface to the *Scots* Reader, prefixed to the *Edinburgh* Edition of that Sermon,

in obedience to Mr. Whitefield's *Order* directed to Mr. *M'Culloch*, is asserted without any Ground. Do you know that Mr. *Whitefield*'s Desire in his Letter to Mr. *M'Culloch*, which you invidiously call *an Order*, was sent to Mr. *Willison* before he wrote his Preface? How then can you satisfy your own Conscience, how will you satisfy the Publick, to assert so confidently what you know not?

I agree with you, that there are many who are perswaded (or pretend that they are) that the Work is delusive, who are not capable to see any Falacy in Mr. *Edwards'* Reasonings. Such will not at any Rate be satisfied.— If there be Hundreds in *Scotland*, as you hope, to whom Mr. *Edwards'* Answers are further Objections against the whole Work; it is strange the Publick have never heard of these new Objections until now: What is yet more surprising, that, while you bring so heavy a Charge, you quarrel only a few of his Answers to three of these many Objections.

You tell the Publick, *It would require a Treatise by itself, to follow the Chain of Error, both in Philosophy and Divinity, that runs through the whole of this Performance.* It is a strong Presumption against this extraordinary Alledgance, that you are the first who hath made this Discovery, after it hath been in so many Hands, skilful both in Philosophy and Divinity; and that two so justly and universally esteemed, as the Reverend Mr. *Couper* at *Boston*, and Mr. *Willison* at *Dundee*, have prefaced it unto the World, without observing that Chain of Error in Philosophy and Divinity that runs through the whole.— Did you imagine, that Men who have Eyes, and incline to use them, would believe this upon your bare Word, especially when they see this Performance founded on Scripture and Reason? Were you not afraid, that when they find you asserting so confidently, what at first View they find false, they'll suspect every Thing else you say?— If you had not Leisure, or

sp

so much Charity to your Fellow-christians, as to write a Treatise by itself, discovering that Chain of Error running through the whole of this Performance; you might have barely pointed at, and given an Index of, these Errors, which no one seeth but yourself. A Page in your *Review* would have served for this, tho' they had been pretty numerous. You stand indebted to your own Credit, to support this your Alledgance.

The Charge you bring against this Sermon is very heavy, *viz. That the manifest Design of it is, to overthrow the very Foundation of Faith, and all practical Godliness; and to establish mere Enthusiasm and strong Delusion, in the Room of the true Religion, revealed and required in the Word.*— Your Proof to support such a Charge had need to be good and unexceptionable. You are pleased, *first*, to say, Pages 11, 12. of your *Review*, That Mr. *Edwards* maintains, *That Images of spiritual Things must be represented to our Fancy, else we can have no Thought about them; That we can have no Thought or Perception of any Thing in the Understanding, unless we have a sensible Representation of it in the Imagination; Which is the same as to say, That we can have no Conception of any Thing, but under a corporeal Form; and so, according to Mr.* Edwards, *we can have no Thought of God, without some visionary Form and Shape represented to our Imagination.*— *And, upon this*, you say, *the whole Scheme of Enthusiasm or Delusion is built.*

Before I proceed to shew that this your Proof is fictitious and imaginary, allow me, *Dear Sir*, to observe the following Things;

First, You should have explain'd some of the Terms of your Charge and Proof, such as, *Enthusiasm*, *Imagination*, *Imaginary*: For tho' your People (of whom you boast, p. 34. that you would not be afraid to venture them upon a comparative Trial with the new Converts themselves) may understand them well enough, yet I am sure ours do not. Give me leave then to explain them as well as I can, for

their

their Sake.— Several of them have enquired at me, from the Beginning of this Work, What *Enthusiasm* is, which the Seceders call this Work? as they also did when, two three Years ago, they heard one of your Number, preaching in the Neighbourhood, say that all the Pulpits of this Church were ringing with *Deism*. For several Days the Enquiry run, What *Deism* was? Which assoon as they knew, they were convinced of the Blackness of the Calumny. So, I hope, it will be with them who come to know what *Enthusiasm* is.

ENTHUSIASM in religious Matters, according to the usual Acceptation of the Word, is a Pretence to Inspiration and immediate Revelation from God, either contrary to the written Word, or what is not warrantable by the said Word and right Reason;— And an *Enthusiast* is one who pretends to this, and an immediate and infallible Conduct of the Spirit in Whole or in Part, as to Faith and Practice.— Hence it appears how far you have been from Exactness in the very first Line of the Paragraph, wherein you bring the Proof mentioned, in saying, The whole Scheme of *Enthusiasm* or *Delusion* is built upon what Mr. *Edwards* says; as if they were the same Thing, and of equal Extent. For tho' all Enthusiasm is *Delusion*, yet every Delusion is not commonly nor can properly be termed *Enthusiasm*. If you mean, that the Position you alledge upon Mr. *Edwards* is the Foundation of all Delusion, as well as Enthusiasm; this makes your Charge yet more extravagant.

All that can be well said, to shew to the Vulgar what is meant by *Imagination* and *imaginary Ideas*, is to caution them, that they are not taken in this Argument for that which is fictitious, feigned, and what is not real; but by Imagination is meant that Power or Faculty in Man, which recalls the Ideas of sensible Objects after they are gone, and presents them from Time to Time to the Understanding, as fit Matter of Thought: And those Images so presented to

the

the Underſtanding, as they are formed in the Imagination, whether in the preciſe Order they ſtruck our Senſes or not, are what Mr. *Edwards* calls imaginary Ideas.—Hence it appears how far you are from ſpeaking like a Philoſopher, when you ſpeak ſo often of a *ſenſible Repreſentation of Things in and upon the Imagination*; particularly, Pages 12, 13. Whatever Repeſentation is in and upon the Imagination is not ſenſible, or *then* the Object of any of the Senſes; but is made unto the Underſtanding *when ſenſible Repreſentations are removed*, and received by it.—You ſhould alſo have known, that theſe Philoſophers who maintain, *Nihil eſt in intellectu, quod non fuit prius in ſenſibus*, deny and diſown all the Conſequences you appear inclined to draw from this Poſition; which tho' you have had in your Eye, yet do not ſeem fully to underſtand, as it is limited and explain'd by them.

To come now to the Proof you bring againſt Mr. *Edwards*' Sermon, as tending to eſtabliſh mere Enthuſiaſm, *&c.* I anſwer; Mr. *Edwards* ſays not one Word of what you alledge upon him, as the Evidence of your Charge againſt his Sermon:—He ſays not one Word in this Argument, but what moſt learned, eminent and orthodox Divines have ſaid before him.—And, if he had ſaid all as groſly as you alledge, it is not the Foundation upon which the whole Scheme of Enthuſiaſm and Deluſion is built, nor hath any natural and neceſſary Tendency to it. If theſe Three be ſufficiently proved, your firſt Argument for eſtabliſhing Enthuſiaſm upon this Sermon, muſt go for nothing.

I aſſert, Mr. *Edwards* ſays nowhere, what you alledge upon him. He ſaith not, *That Images of ſpiritual Things muſt be repreſented to our Fancy, elſe we can have no Thought about them; and that we can have no Thought of God, without ſome viſionary Form or Shape repreſented to our Imagination.* All theſe are your own Words, and a groſs, palpable Perverſion

of

of Mr. *Edwards*. He indeed faith, as you quote him, "Such is our Nature, that we can't think of "Things invisible, without a Degree of Imagina-"tion. I dare appeal to any Man of the greatest "Powers of Mind, whether or no he is able to fix "his Thoughts on God or Christ, or the Things of "another World, without imaginary Ideas attending "his Meditation." Every intelligent Person will observe, that there is a great Difference between *imaginary Ideas* attending our Meditations of God, which is Mr. *Edwards'* Expression; and *imaginary Ideas* of God, which you alledge he faith:—A great Difference between his asserting, *We cannot think of Things invisible, without some Degree of Imagination*, and, in another Place, *without some Exercise of this Faculty*; and what you alledge upon him, *That we can have no Thought of spiritual Things, unless the Image of them be represented to our Fancy*; and, *That we can have no Thought of God, without some visionary Form or Shape represented to our Imagination.* Mr. *Edwards'* Words neither express, nor imply, what you alledge in perverting them; and therefore all your After-reasoning is not against any Thing Mr. *Edwards* faith, but against the perverted Meaning of his Words.—I appeal to yourself, if you can think upon the negative Perfections of God, or upon his Perfections figuratively represented to us, without imaginary Ideas attending your Meditations. For Instance; Can you think upon the *Spirituality* of the Divine Nature, without the imaginary Idea of a Body, which is an Imperfection, and which your Understanding must remove from your Conception of God, in thinking upon this Perfection? Can you think upon his *Immensity*, without an imaginary Idea of being limited to a certain Place, which is an Imperfection, and which your Understanding must remove altogether from your Conception of God? Can you think upon any of the metaphorical and figurative Expressions in the holy Scriptures of God's Pet-

Perfections, ſuch as the *Hand*, *Arm*, *Eyes* of the Lord, *&c.* without an imaginary Idea of the Metaphors or Figures expreſſing theſe Perfections to us? All this ought to be done without any the leaſt imaginary Idea of God; and yet there cannot but be imaginary Ideas, tho' not of him, attending theſe our Meditations upon him.

2*dly*, I aſſert, That Mr. *Edwards* hath ſaid nothing in theſe his Words, you have ſo unfairly wreſted, but what the beſt and ableſt of our Divines have ſaid before him, and much in the ſame Terms; of which I might give many Inſtances.

Judicious *Flavel*, Vol. 1. *Edinburgh* Edition 1731, Page 328. obſerves, "Truth now is forced in Compliance with our Weakneſs, and Diſtance from the Fountain, to deſcend from Heaven under Vails, Shadows and Umbrages, thereby to contract ſome kind of Affinity with our Fancy and exterior Senſes firſt, that ſo it may with more Advantage tranſmit itſelf to our Underſtandings. It muſt come under ſome Vail or other to us, whilſt we are vail'd with Mortality; becauſe the Soul cannot behold it in its native Luſtre, nor converſe otherwiſe with it."

Anthony Burgeſs, in his Book upon *Original Sin*, Page 355. ſaith, "Theſe Forms and Repreſentations in the Fancy, when we think of God, ariſe from the natural Conſtitution of Man, ſo that it cannot be avoided: It doth ariſe from our finite and corporeal Nature, whereby nothing can come into the Underſtanding before it hath been in the Senſe and the Imagination.—Yet it is the Duty of the Underſtanding to expel them, and to conceive of God without any corporeal Form, as a Spirit of infinite Majeſty."

Mr. *Charnock*, a Man of the greateſt Learning and Reading, not only ſpeaks much in the ſame Terms with Mr. *Edwards*, but explains and illuſtrates what he ſaith at great Length, Vol. 1. *London* Edition 1684,

Page 118. "Since, by the Condition of our "Nature, nothing erects a Notion of itself in our "Understanding, but as it is conducted in by our "Sense; God hath served himself of those Things "which are most exposed to our Sense, most obvi-"ous to our Understandings, to give us some Ac-"quaintance with his own Nature, and those Things "which otherwise we were not capable of having "any Notion of." And again he saith more expresly, Page 125. "Tho' we must not conceive of God as "of a human or corporeal Shape, yet we cannot "think of God without some Reflexion upon our "own Being.— While we are in the Body, and sur-"rounded with fleshly Matter, we cannot think of "Things without some Help from corporeal Repre-"sentations: Something of Sense will interpose it-"self, in our purest Conceptions of spiritual Things." This Subject is explained by him in the 123, 124, & 125. Pages. From these Instances you may see, Mr. *Edwards* is not the first who hath asserted, That we cannot think of Things invisible, without imaginary Ideas attending our Meditations; and that this is vastly distant from admitting imaginary Ideas of God, which you endeavour to wrest Mr. *Edwards'* Words unto: And that you may as well adduce the Words of these great Saints, to prove that it is the *manifest Design of their Works, to overthrow the very Foundation of Faith, and all practical Godliness, and to establish mere Enthusiasm, and strong Delusion, in the Room of the true Religion, revealed and required in the Word*; as you adduce the same Expressions of Mr. *Edwards* to prove this Charge against his Sermon.

3*dly*, I assert, Mr. *Edwards'* Position, you put so many forced Meanings upon, taken with all your Perversions of it, is not the Foundation upon which the whole Scheme of Enthusiasm and Delusion is built, and is not Proof and Evidence of the black Charge you bring against this Sermon; for these two good Reasons: *First*, There have been some Here-

ticks,

ticks, who have had these gross and abominable Notions, you unjustly charge upon Mr. *Edwards*, who were very far from Enthusiasm; such as *Vostius* and other Hereticks. 2*dly*, Many Enthusiasts, if not the most of them, and many others under the Delusion of Error, have been orthodox and sound as to the Spirituality of God. You are the first Author of such an extravagant Assertion, of which also you bring not the least Evidence. Thus far concerning your first Proof, which I imagine will now appear even to yourself in every Shape insufficient.

Tho' your After-reasoning doth not affect any Thing said by Mr. *Edwards*, yet it would be too great Indolence not to observe several Blunders you have committed, both in Philosophy and Divinity.

First, You assert, *That if we have any imaginary Idea of Christ* (for this you all alongst make the same with the nonsensical Term of a sensible Representation upon the Imagination) *we do that very Moment think upon a false Christ.* Now, *Sir*, Is not the blessed Jesus true and very Man? Had he not a true Body whilst he was here upon Earth? Hath he not that same Body now in Heaven? Can you, or any Man else, think upon him really as he is, God-Man, without an imaginary Idea of it? Can you think of him scourged by *Pilate*, crowned with Thorns, led to Mount *Calvary*, and there crucified, without an imaginary Idea of him? How can you say, This will be to think upon a false Christ; when you cannot think upon the true Christ, but as God-Man, in two distinct Natures, and one Person for ever? Unless you set up for the Heresy, That Jesus Christ had a human Body only in Appearance, and not in Reality; or that his Body, now in Heaven, hath none of the essential Properties of a real Body. Hence,

2*dly*, Your Blunder continues in the Instance you give of the Act of Believing or Receiving Christ, as revealed and exhibited in the Gospel-promise. Is he not revealed and exhibited as God-Man? Can you

think then justly upon him, without an imaginary Idea of him as Man? Can you receive him as offered, without this? You say, P. 13. This *would be a seeing of a sensible Object.* Well said, *Sir*, you are the first Philosopher who ever advanced, that to have an imaginary Idea of an absent Man, was to see a sensible Object. The Boys in the logical Class can tell you, That by our bodily Senses we apprehend bodily Things present, and by our Imagination we apprehend Things absent.

3 *dly*, Neither is it true, That all who have had the least visionary Representation of God, or of Christ, formed in their Imagination, did that very Moment think upon a false God, and a false Christ, as you, without due Reflexion, assert. *Daniel* had a visionary Representation of God in his Imagination, *Dan.* vii. 9. and *John*, of Jesus Christ, in the first of the *Revelation.* Will you say, that while they had it, reflected upon it afterwards, and related it, they thought upon a false God, and upon a false Christ?

4*thly*, Your Assertion, *That our Senses and Imagination cannot assist us at all in thinking upon the Divine Nature and Perfections*, is in flat Contradiction to what the Apostle *Paul* saith, *Romans* i. 20. *For the invisible Things of him, from the Creation of the World, are clearly seen, being understood by the Things that are made, even his eternal Power and Godhead.* Tho' there can be no Representation formed on the Imagination of the Eternity, Omnipresence, Omniscience and Omnipotence of God; yet our Senses and Imagination are greatly helpful to bring us to the Knowledge of the Divine Nature and Perfections; as the Apostle declares, not only in the Scripture quoted, but also *Acts* xvii. 27.

You conclude your Argument thus; *And indeed the visionary Representation of invisible Objects in the Imagination, hath been at the Bottom of all the Delusions that have ever hitherto taken place in the World.* Now, Sir, hath it been at the Bottom of the *Socinian*

Errors

Errors and Delusions, particularly their denying the Personality of the Holy Spirit? Hath it been at the Bottom of the Delusions of the *Sadducees* antient and modern, who acknowledge neither Angel nor Spirit? Is it at the Bottom of the Delusion of *Deists* and *Infidels*, who deny all Inspiration and Revelation, and of an Hundred other Delusions, which have no Connection with this? When you wrote this, you should have reflected, that you were not now giving a doctrinal Testimony to your Hearers, but writing to many, who will not admit what you say without their being satisfied as to the Truth of it.---You add, *and it is the fertile Source of all satanical Imposture.* Now, Sir, hath not this been, where it was not the Source of any satanical Imposture; as in the Instance of the Protomartyr *Stephen*, *Acts* vii. and other Instances already given? Will you say it was the Source of satanical Imposture in these worthy Saints, and reforming Ministers, mentioned by Mr. *Robert Fleming* and others, of which I could give you plenty of Instances? I shall only name one mentioned by Mr. *Fleming* in his *Scripture-truth confirmed*, *Edin.* Edit. 1732, Pages 171. and 172. Mr. *Robert Scot*, a truly godly and able Minister of Christ at *Glasgow*, died *January* 18th 1629. "And, a little before his Death, he lay sometime as "in a Kind of Trance, and, after his awaking out of "it, took off his Night-cap, and threw it to the Bed-"foot, and cried out, I have now seen the Lord, "and heard him say, Make Way for my faithful "Servant Mr. *Robert Scot*, bidding his Friends Fare-"well; and then after died."---Be all this as it will, Mr. *Edwards* hath not one Syllable either of visionary Representation, or sensible Representation of invisible Objects upon the Imagination; and therefore your Inferences, true or false, do not in the least affect any Thing said by him.

The *second* Proof you adduce, of your Charge of Enthusiasim against Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon, is yet a more astonishing Perversion of his Words. If I had

not

not seen it, I could not have believed that you, or any Man pretending to Candour and common Honesty, could have been guilty of it, to serve any End whatever. You say, *Mr.* Edwards *acknowledges, that this Work is begun by Representation of dreadful Objects upon the Imagination, which, after violent bodily Agitations, are succeeded by imaginary or visionary Representations, seemingly more agreeable.* In all this you grosly misrepresent Mr. *Edwards.*

For he nowhere saith, *That this Work is begun by Representation of dreadful Objects upon the Imagination, such as material Flames, which the Distressed apprehend to be the Flames of Hell-fire; and the dreadful Pit of Destruction, of which they have a visionary Representation,* as you alledge he doth.—He is so far from saying any Thing like this, that he saith the contrary in most express Terms, *London* Edition p. 47. *Edinb.* Edit. p. 53. "Of the Multitude of those "of the former Sort, that I have had Opportunity "to observe, and have been acquainted with, there "have been very few, but by all that could be ob-"served in them, in the Time of it, or afterwards, "their Distress has arisen from real proper Con-"viction, and a being in a Degree sensible of that "which was the Truth." Alas for you, my Brother! Could you see this Passage, and yet write, that Mr. *Edwards* acknowledgeth this Work is begun by Representation of dreadful Objects upon the Imagination? Had you no Remembrance of the God of Truth, whose Eyes are upon the Truth, and to whom all Falsifying is an Abomination? Doth not Mr. *Edwards* say in the very Passage you quote, that this Work is begun in a distinct Sight of Sin, which is followed with a Sight of God's dreadful Wrath due to them because of it?—I shall present the Reader with the Passage as it is in Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon, *Lond.* Edit. p. 48. *Edinb.* Edit. p. 54. "Those "that are in such Extremity, commonly express a "great Sense of their exceeding Wickedness, the "Mul-

" Multitude and Aggravations of their actual Sins, " and the dreadful Pollution, Enmity and Per- " verseness of their Hearts, and a dreadful Obsti- " nacy and Hardness of Heart, a Sense of their " great Guilt in the Sight of God, and the Dread- " fulness of the Punishment that Sin exposes to." And then follow the Words you quote; " Very of- " ten they have a lively Idea of the horrible Pit of " eternal Misery, *&c.*"— If you had not skipped over and left out these Words of Mr. *Edwards*, the Reader would have seen that he doth not say, or acknowledge, that this Work is begun with a Sight and Sense of the Wrath of God, but with a Sight and Sense of the Evil of Sin; and hence, that the Apprehension and Fear of Wrath and Destruction, the Distressed have, are not without Ground, but just and reasonable.— This would have prevented your misrepresenting what Mr. *Edwards* saith is the Beginning and Rise of this Work upon the Distressed.

The Passage itself, that you quote, you not only further pervert in the most shamless Way, but leave out several Sentences, which would have shewn your wresting them to a Meaning they are not capable of. It is in Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon as followeth; " They have a lively Idea of the horrible Pit of e- " ternal Misery; and at the same Time it appears to " them, that a great God, that hath them in his Hands, " is exceeding angry with them. His Wrath appears " amazingly terrible to them. God appearing to them " so much provoked, and his great Wrath so incen- " sed; they are apprehensive of great Danger, that he " will not bear with them any longer, but will now " forthwith cut them off, and send them down to " the dreadful Pit they have in View; at the same " Time seeing no Refuge." The following Sentence you skip over, as what would have shewn your Unfair-dealing, if there had been no more. It runs thus; " They see more and more of the Vanity of " every Thing they used to trust to, and flatter

" them-

" themſelves in; till they are brought wholly to de-
" ſpair in all, and to ſee they are at the Diſpoſal of
" the mere Will of that God, that is ſo angry at
" them." And then follows the broken Sentence you ſet down: And even that, with leaving out ſome Words, would have ſhown that their Extremity is not begun with a Repreſentation of dreadful Objects upon their Imagination. The Words are, as in Mr. *Edwards*; *Very many, in the midſt of their Extremity, have been brought to an extraordinary Senſe of their fully deſerving that Wrath and Deſtruction which is then before their Eyes.* You think beſt to leave out, *That they are brought to this in the midſt of their Extremity*; becauſe it contradicts your ſaying, Mr. *Edwards* acknowledgeth this Work is begun with it.

Now, I appeal to every unprejudiſed and honeſt Mind, whether the obvious Meaning of theſe Words is, that they have a lively ſenſible Repreſentation carried in upon their Imagination of material Flames, that they apprehend to be the Flames of Hell-fire? Is there the leaſt Word inſinuating that Satan works them up to Horror and Deſpair? Is there the leaſt Word of their having a viſionary Repreſentation of the dreadful Pit? This can be no more gathered from Mr. *Edwards'* ſaying, that they *have a lively Idea of the horrible Pit of eternal Miſery that they have in their View; that they have Wrath and Deſtruction before their Eyes*; than it can be gathered from his ſaying, That God appeareth provoked with them; that they ſee the Vanity of all they formerly truſted to; that they ſee that they are at the Diſpoſal of the mere Will of God; than it can be gathered, I ſay, from ſuch Expreſſions, that they have a viſionary View of all theſe Things. Is it not evident, Mr. *Edwards*, in this whole Period, ſpeaks of a ſpiritual Sight from the Law of God, in the manifeſting Light of the Holy Spirit? Does he not all along ſpeak in Scripture-terms, or agreeably to them? If your groſs Alledg-

ance

ance be the obvious Meaning of ſuch Scripture-terms, it is alſo of what Mr. *Edwards* ſaith; but not otherwiſe.-- Do not ſome of our beſt Preachers ſpeak in his Terms, yea, much ſtronger? — But did it ever enter into the Head of any one, to give ſuch a Meaning of their Words, as you have done of Mr. *Edwards'*? — Becauſe I write, to undeceive the Populace, and theſe of ſmall Underſtanding, who are the only Perſons in danger of being impoſed upon by you; I ſhall give an Inſtance or two from Sermons you will not except againſt. The firſt is from Mr. *Shepherd*, one of theſe you refer to in your *Review*. In his *Sound Believer*, p. 22. he ſaith, *But when it ſees the bottomleſs Pit before it, everlaſting Fire before it, for the leaſt Sin; now it ſees the hainous Evil of Sin.--- It ſees there are endleſs Woes and everlaſting Death that ly in wait for it.*— P. 30. *And, together with this real Sight of Sin, the Soul doth not ſee painted Fire, but ſees the Fire of God's Wrath really.* Now, *Dear Sir*, hath the Paſſage from Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon any other obvious Meaning than theſe Expreſſions of Mr. *Shepherd's* have?

The other Inſtance is from a Sermon of Mr. *Ralph Erskine's*, intituled, *The giving Love of Chriſt*, p. 33. *And oh that the Spirit of God would convince you of Sin, and let you ſee that you are lying at the very Mouth of Hell, ready to tumble into the Pit of eternal Torments!* — What would you ſay of the Man who would put your obvious Meaning upon your Friend's Words, which are as capable of it as theſe of Mr. *Edwards'*? And is it poſſible you could write what followeth without ſome Struggle and Remorſe? -- *If I had ventured to give ſuch an Account as this of the Spring and Riſe of what they call their Convictions, they would be ready to call it in queſtion; but I ſuppoſe none will diſcredit the Account when it comes from Mr.* Edwards, &c. — Let the Reader now judge whether the Account you give be Mr. *Edwards'* or yours.--- Pray, Sir, to whom did you write? Did you ſuppoſe your Readers were to be only Children

or Fools? You certainly treat them as ſuch, in ſuppoſing they would take the black Account you give of this Work, for Mr. *Edwards'* Account of it, contrary to their own Sight.— I leave you to the Reader's Cenſure.

The corroborative Proof you bring, that you have given the true Meaning of Mr. *Edwards'* Words, is impertinent and inſufficient. It is thus, p. 55. he ſaith, *There have been ſome Inſtances very much like theſe Demoniacks that we read of*, Mark i. 16. Chap. ix. 26. *of whom we read, that when Satan had cried with a loud Voice, and rent them ſore, he came out of them; and probably*, ſays he, *theſe Inſtances were deſigned as a Type of ſuch Things as theſe.*— What you propoſe to prove by this is, That it is the obvious Meaning of Mr. *Edwards'* Words, that this Work began with *all* the diſtreſſed Subjects of it, by Repreſentations of dreadful Objects upon their Imagination, ſuch as the material Flames of Hell. Pray, Sir, how doth this Paſſage ſhow that you have given the true Meaning of Mr. *Edwards'* Words?— Had theſe Demoniacks Repreſentations of ſuch dreadful Objects upon their Imagination? Doth either the Scripture or Mr. *Edwards* ſay they had? Or doth Mr. *Edwards* ſay this of theſe few Inſtances, whom he compares to theſe Demoniacks in the Circumſtance of their Deliverance?—If he had ſaid all this of theſe few, it would not have proved what you alledge, namely, That Mr. *Edwards* ſaith that this was the Caſe of all the Diſtreſſed of whom he ſpeaks in the former Paſſage; ſeeing that what he aſcribes to theſe few, was peculiar to them, and wherein they were diſtinguiſhed from all others.

You further proceed, p. 15. ſhamefully to pervert Mr. *Edwards'* Words, in comparing theſe few Inſtances of the Diſtreſſed to the Demoniacks mentioned. Mr. *Edwards* compares them only in one Particular, namely, in this; That *as when Satan had cried out with a loud Voice, and rent them ſore, he came out of them;*

them; so some few, after a severe Fit of bodily Distress caused by their Convictions, were delivered by the Grace of Jesus Christ. And thus far, at least, your Friend Mr. *Ralph Erskine* goes, when, in his memorable Letter to Mr. *Wesley* a Minister of the Church of *England*, he says (*a*), "The last Instance you give "give of some struggling as in the Agonies of Death, "and in such a Manner as that Four or Five strong Men "can hardly restrain a weak Woman from hurting "herself or others; — this is to me somewhat more "inexplicable, if it do not resemble the Child spoke "of, *Mark* ix. 26. and *Luke* ix. 42. of whom it is "said, that, while he was yet coming, the Devil "threw him down and tare him. *&c.*" Mr. *Edwards* restricts the Comparison to the above-mentioned Particular; as is evident, not only from his own express Words, but from his Reference to the Instance of the Demoniack, *Mark* i. 26. as well as to the other, *Mark* ix. 26.— Now, these two Instances agree only in this precise Point noticed in the 26th Verse of both these Chapters, and which Mr. *Edwards* only quotes and refers to, *viz.* That *when the Devil had cried with a loud Voice, and rent them sore, he came out of them.*— There is no mention of the Effects of the Diabolical Possession mentioned in the Instance, *Mark* ix. to have been in the Demoniack, *Mark* i. — From all which it is evident how unfairly you deal, in making Mr. *Edwards'* Comparison to consist in a Likeness between the Effects upon the Demoniack, *Mark* ix. and the bodily Distresses of the Few he mentions, which he never meant; his Words expressly restricting the Comparison to the precise Point already mentioned, wherein both the Demoniacks were alike.

What you add is equally unfair, namely, That Mr. *Edwards connects such bodily Agonies with the Marks of the true Spirit.* This he nowhere doth from one End of his Sermon to the other. He indeed sheweth, *Lond.* Edit. p. 17. *Edinb.* Edit. p. 21. That bodily Ago-

 nies

(*a*) *Wesley's* Journal, p. 62. *June* 1735.

nies is no Argument to prove, that Persons under them are not under the Influence of the Spirit of God; but doth not connect them, as you alledge, with the Marks of the true Spirit: Yea, he expresly saith, last-quoted Page, *We can't conclude that Persons are under the Influence of the true Spirit, because we see such Effects upon their Bodies, because this is not given as a Mark of the true Spirit.*— I have a better Opinion of some of your Party, than not to think that they'll blush on your behalf, at the reading of this, whatever you may do.

From all this 'tis obvious, how much you wrong this good Man, in saying, That *he makes the Work of Satan typical of the Work of the Spirit of God.*— He saith indeed, That Satan's being forced to come out of these Demoniacks, no more for ever to enter into them, at our Lord's Command, and his crying out and renting them sore at his going out, might probably be designed for a Type of such Things as these. So that it is not the Devil's Work in tormenting at Times one of these Demoniacks, as you misrepresent him; but Christ's Work in casting the Devils out of both these Demoniacks, permitting them to rent them sore at their coming out, that his Power in casting them out against their Wills, might be the more conspicuous; 'tis this last, Mr. *Edwards* saith, might PROBABLY be intended to be a Type of Christ's delivering Sinners by his Spirit, from the spiritual Power and Dominion of the Devil, in such particular Circumstances.— What Mr. *Edwards* advanceth only as a probable Opinion, others have said it before him in pretty positive Terms. *Chimnitius* upon *Mark* ix. and the parallel Places, says, *In all this there is a Type evidently shadowing out to us our spiritual Deliverance from the Kingdom of Satan.*— And *Jerome* thinks that the Devil renting the Demoniack, *Mark* i. 26.- when he was cast out, signifies, that, when he is forced to let a Sinner go from under his spiritual Dominion, he will set upon the Sinner more violently.— And now, after all, the Reader may judge

judge, *if you have as yet got Freedom to use Mr.* Edwards' *Words*, whether you have best Reason to apply them to him who saith, That Christ's casting the Devil out of these Demoniacks, and permitting him to rent them sore at that Time, might PROBABLY be intended for a Type of such Things as these; or to yourself, who ascribe a Work of Conviction and Conversion upon many, which is the peculiar Work of the Holy Spirit, to an unclean Spirit?

Here you break your Argument in the Middle, to have a Hit at the Reverend Mr. *Webster*; but, as it is in your usual Way of perverting and wresting Words, you touch him not. Mr. *Webster*, p. 32. of his excellent Letter, having said, "That, whatever Judgment we form of such whose Concern is attended with unusual Symptoms, it can never found a general Charge, nor weaken the Argument for the Genuinness of this Work with respect to others.— He gives this Reason for it; "For allowing that Satan, who no doubt is present at such Meetings of the Sons of God, was permitted to harrass several Persons in this extraordinary Manner, it would no more prove the Work in general delusive or diabolical, than the Charge could be brought against our Saviour, and such as through his Word believed on God;—Satan being then permitted to tear Multitudes, and cast them down to the Ground."

Mr. *Webster*'s Thought is far from being extravagant as you call it, but very just. It hath no Affinity with Mr. *Edwards*' Remark, and there is no Reason to think he took the Hint from it, as you alledge; and, if he had, it would have been no Reproach upon him. He doth not say that *Satan* was permitted to tear Multitudes of these who thro' the Word of Christ believed on God, as you wrest his Words; such a Sense put upon them would make them Nonsense indeed. For in his Argument, that proceeds

upon

upon the Supposition that all these Persons, whose Concern is attended with unusual Symptoms, were under diabolical Influence, he saith, It would be no Argument to prove that the Many, who were not under those Symptoms, were not converted by the Spirit of God; more than it would be an Argument against their real Conversion who believed on God thro' Christ's Word, because that *Satan* cast down and tare Multitudes, by the Permission of God, in Christ's Presence, and where he had been teaching. The parallel Branches of his Argument are, the Numbers who are converted at this Time without unusual Symptoms attending their Concern; and these in our Saviour's Time who believed on God thro' his Word, and never had been under any diabolical Possession. The second parallel Branch is, these who have at this Time had unusual Symptoms attending their Concern, from whose Case the Objection against this Work is taken; and these *Demoniacks* that were cast down to the Ground and torn in our Saviour's Presence. From this 'tis evident, that Mr. *Webster* doth neither assert nor insinuate that *Satan* was permitted to cast down and tear Multitudes of them who believed upon God. This wrested Meaning you put upon his Words, either thro' your not understanding his Argument, or some worse Cause, is obviously childish. As to what you say afterwards, *That neither Mr.* Webster, *nor any for him, will be capable to make good, that* Satan *cast down to the Ground, and tare one, at any of Christ's Sermons, let be Multitudes.* One of the Instances under Consideration proves this as to one: For it was in the Synagogue at *Capernaum*, when Christ was preaching or teaching, as it is expressly said, *Mark* i. 21. that the *Demoniack* there was cast down to the Ground and sore rent. Multitudes of these *Demoniacks* were brought to our Saviour to be cured, where he was preaching; but the Cure was ordinarily delayed until his Sermons were ended, as you may see, *Luke* vi. 17, 18. And is it very probable that the tormenting

menting Effects of the Possession ceased during our Saviour's Sermons, and not rather that the Devil would rage the more, knowing that his Time was but short? Whereas you conclude, "'Tis plain, that "*Satan* was dispossessed before any such believed, "and that he never afterwards tare or cast them "down;" This, whether true or false, makes nothing against Mr. *Webster*, who controverts neither the one or the other. You had much better gone on with your fanciful Account, than interrupted it with this weak Sally.

You return to your Narrative, and give such another Description of the Outgate of these spiritually distress'd Persons, as you have given of their Distress, pretending you have it from Mr. *Edwards*: Than which nothing can be more false; for it is directly contrary to what he expresly saith of it in his Sermon. You say, *That, in their Extremity, they desire and wish for Ease at any Rate.* Where doth Mr. *Edwards* say this? In none of the Passages you quote from him, nor in any other Part of his Sermon. How can you then say so confidently, that this is exactly agreeable to Mr. *Edwards'* own Account? He asserts in express Terms the contrary, *That they have got such Scripture-views of the Sovereignty of God, whereby their Minds have been calmed, and they have been brought as it were to ly at God's Foot; and after great Agonies, a little before Light has arisen, they have been composed and quiet, in a kind of Submission to a just and sovereign God.* It will be the more astonishing to the Reader, that this Passage could not but be in your Eye, seeing it immediately preceeds that you quote from Mr. *Edwards*, and upon which you pretend to found your Account. And again he saith, *Lond.* Edit. P. 37. *Edinb.* Edit. P. 42. *Such are earnestly concern'd for their eternal Salvation, and sensible of their Need of God's Pity and Help, and engaged to seek it in the Use of the Means that God hath appointed.* Is this like People who desire and wish for Ease at

any

any Rate? No, *Sir*, it is not Ease, but Healing and Salvation, they desire and wish for. I have had many in these Circumstances with me, who have professed, that they would not have been without the uneasy Sight of their Sin and Danger, they had been brought to, for a World; and that they desired not Deliverance from it, but in the Lord's Way, and not until his Time. And such were these Mr. *Edwards* speaks of, by the Account he gives of them.

You proceed, by saying, *That* Satan *finding them thus prepared, he suits the Deliverance to the Nature of the Work, by making a Representation upon their Imagination, of what appears most agreeable to their Senses, attended with a strong Perswasion of the Reality of what they see and hear, and consequently that they are really converted (the Strength of the Delusion lying there) and so they come to be filled with extatick Joys and Raptures.*— And then you conclude, *This is exactly agreeable to Mr.* Edwards' *Account of their Outgate*, P. 55. If you had given the whole Account of their Outgate as in Mr. *Edwards*, every serious Person would have wished to have found the same Operations upon his own Soul. And now, *my dear Sir*, I shall give the whole Passage as it is in Mr. *Edwards*, and leave it to the Reader to judge, if the Account you give of their Outgate be exactly agreeable to Mr. *Edwards'* Account of it, or if it be not in every Clause contrary to it.—*And then Light has appeared, and a glorious Redeemer, with his wonderful, all-sufficient Grace, has been represented to them often, in some sweet Invitation of Scripture. Sometimes the Light comes in suddenly, sometimes more gradually; filling their Souls with Love, Admiration, Joy,* [Here Mr. *Fisher* stops with *&c.*] *and Self-abasement, drawing forth their Hearts in Longing after the excellent lovely Redeemer, and Longings to ly in the Dust before him; and Longings that others might behold him, and embrace him, and be delivered by him; and Longings to live to his Glory; but sensible that they can do nothing*

of

of themselves, appearing vile in their own Eyes, and having much of a Jealousy over their own Hearts. And all the Appearances of a real Change of Heart have followed; and Grace has acted, from Time to Time, after the same Manner that it used to act in those that were converted formerly, with the like Difficulties, Temptations, Buffetings, and like Comforts; excepting that, in many, Light and Comfort has been in higher Degree than ordinary.—My dear Friend, say yourself, is your Account of their Outgate exactly agreeable to Mr. *Edwards'* Account of it? Is there the least Insinuation, Sentence or Word in his Account, from which you can gather yours? Is there any Thing here like the Work of the Devil? Doth not every Stroke look like the Work of the Holy Spirit?

Your Account of their Outgate is as little agreeable to the second Passage you cite from Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon; it is only a broken Sentence, the better to impose upon your Readers. The Passage in its Connection is as followeth; *Lond.* Edit. P. 23. *Edinb.* Edit. P. 27. *It is no Argument that a Work is not a Work of the Spirit of God, that some, that are the Subjects of it, have in some extraordinary Frames been in a kind of Extasy, wherein they have been carried beyond themselves, and have had their Minds transported into a Train of strong and pleasing Imaginations, and kind of Visions, as tho' they were wrapt up even to Heaven, and there saw glorious Sights.*—Now, let the Reader observe your Unfair-dealing. For, *First*, Mr. *Edwards* speaks here of some very few in this Case; you represent him here as speaking of *all* the Distressed. 2*dly*, Mr. *Edwards'* Design is to shew, that this particular Case is no Argument that this Work is not the Work of the Spirit of God; and that this particular Case may be accounted for without bringing the Devil into the Account: All which he strongly proves, and so as you shall never be able to overturn, tho' you should have done it, if you had acted fairly. But you was wiser than take any

Notice of this. Is then your ascribing this Work to the Devil, exactly agreeable to Mr. *Edwards'* Account of their Outgate? 3*dly*, Mr. *Edwards*, expresly condemns laying any Weight upon such Imaginations, and saith, That there is commonly something in them that is confused, improper and false; and that they are not directly from the Spirit of God, but flow from the Constitution of these very few Instances. So that you have not the least Ground from this Passage of Mr. *Edwards'*, to say that this is the Way of the Outgate of the greatest Part of the Distressed; nay, not so much that it is the Way how these few come to an Outgate: For he is giving no Account of their Outgate in this Paragraph. Much less have you Reason to say from him, that these Imaginations are from the Devil, or that these Persons conclude from them that they are converted. What you add is amazing Confidence, *That after this they cannot endure to have their Conversion so much as questioned.* Is this likewise exactly agreeable to Mr. *Edwards'* Account? A few Lines below the first Passage you quote from him, he declares the contrary, *That they have much of a Jealousy over their own Hearts, and that they have like Difficulties, Buffetings and Temptations with these formerly converted.* The Sum of the Account, you say Mr. *Edwards* gives, is, That the Devil is the Author of their Convictions, and the Author of their Outgate; and that he doth this in a Sermon, wherein his professed Design is to shew that this is not the Work of the Devil, but of the Spirit of God. Who will believe a Thing so extraordinary and unfeasible? *Credat Judeus apella.*

Your horrid Abuse of the Parable, *Mat.* xii. 43, 44, 45. in applying it to the Persons Mr. *Edwards* gives an Account of, is now obvious. The Case you apply it to is none of theirs. Whatever is the Scope of the Parable, it can only be applied to Cases similar to that of the Generation to which our blessed Lord applies it; as is plain from his concluding

it

it thus, *Even so shall it be to this wicked Generation.* In a Suitableness to this, famous Mr. *Dickson* saith, That the Scope of it is to shew, that this People, by their refusing the Grace of God and to believe on Christ, were in a sevenfold worse Condition than if the Gospel had never been preached to them.

You put a new Line into their Character, not given before, *viz. That they always have an Aversion to any Testimony for the visible Kingdom of Christ.* If you mean your *Act and Testimony*, I did not know that you had intended it for *America*, that it had come to their Knowledge, and that they had shewn an Aversion to it. Or is there any other Act and Testimony in that Country they have shewn an Aversion to? Is this exactly agreeable to Mr. *Edwards'* Account? In what Part of his Sermon doth he say or insinuate any such Thing? I am sure you can point to none.

Thus I have followed you through the second Proof of your Charge against this Sermon, and methinks have made it clear as the Light, that the Whole is without Foundation; and that Mr. *Edwards* doth not acknowledge *that this Work is begun by Representation of dreadful Objects upon the Imagination, which, after violent bodily Agitations, are succeeded by imaginary or visionary Representations seemingly more agreeable.*

I proceed to consider your third Argument to prove your Charge, which is, That Mr. *Edwards sets aside Scripture-experiences altogether, from being any Standard, whereby to judge of the Conformity of our Experiences to the Work of the Spirit of God upon others as described in the Word.* There can be nothing more groundless than this Alledgance. He says nothing upon this Article, but what all orthodox Divines have said before him, and what every reasonable unprejudised Man would have assented to, if you had represented it fairly. He says nothing but what by a Variety of convincing Arguments he

 proves,

proves, which you ſhould have conſidered and refuted if you could: But you are wiſer than meddle with any one of them. The Juſtneſs and Truth of what he ſaith upon this Subject, and the Abſurdity of what you muſt ſay in contradicting him, as alſo your Honeſty in the Account you give of his Opinion, will appear by ſetting the one againſt the other.

What Mr. *Edwards* ſaith is,	What you aſſert is,
That if a Work of Conviction and Converſion agree with Scripture-inſtances in the Eſſentials of the Work, or in thoſe Things that the Word of God has given us as the diſtinguiſhing Signs of a Work of his Spirit; it is no Sign that it is not a Work of the Spirit, altho' it differ in many Circumſtances from all Inſtances that have been before, either in the Scripture or elſewhere.	*That altho' a Work of Conviction and Converſion agree with Scripture-inſtances in the Eſſentials of the Work, or in thoſe Things that the Word of God has given us as the diſtinguiſhing Signs of a Work of the Spirit; yet if it vary in any Circumſtance from Inſtances recorded in Scripture, and if there be not a Conformity in every Circumſtance, it cannot be the Work of the Spirit of God, but muſt be the Work of the Devil.*
Mr. *Edwards* ſaith,	You ſay,
That, allowing that no Inſtances can be brought from the Scripture of any bodily Effects of a Work of the Holy Spirit upon the Soul; yet we cannot conclude from this, that Perſons, under theſe bodily Diſtreſſes, are not under a Work of the Spirit: Becauſe neither Reaſon, nor any Rule of Scripture, excludes ſuch Things.	*If there be ſuch bodily Effects, there cannot be a Work of the Holy Spirit upon the Subjects of them; altho' they have Scripture-marks of ſuch a Work upon their Souls.*
	If theſe Things be not your Aſſertions, you ſay nothing in Contradiction to Mr. *Edwards.*

Now, *Sir*, let the Reader judge, whether the Account you have given of what Mr. *Edwards* ſaith be

be fair and just.— If you had given the very first Passage you quote from his Sermon intire, the Reader would have seen that you had alledged against him what he never said, what he never meant: But you give only one Half of a Sentence, and leave out the express Limitation of what he asserts.— It is thus in Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon; *No Deviation from what hath hitherto been usual, let it be never so great, is an Argument that a Work is not the Work of the Spirit of God, if it be no Deviation from the Rule that God hath given to judge of a Work of his Spirit by.*— Why did you leave out the last Half of the Sentence, where Mr. *Edwards* limits and explains the Deviation he speaks of? — Can you say that the first Part of the Sentence, without this, is a fair Representation of what he affirms in this Subject? Let the Reader judge. As he supports unanswerably what he asserts here, so he saith nothing but what all orthodox Divines have said upon this Subject before him. Famous Mr. *Dickson* saith it expresly, *Thera. sacra*, p. 464, 465, 466.

" This Ground of judging of Mens Conversion
" by the Manner of God's exercising of them, so as
" other converted Saints have been exercised before
" them, and of judging the Man to be unregene-
" rate, who is otherwise exercised than they know
" any Convert to have been exercised, did deceive
" the Friends of *Job*, who in *Job*'s Face avowed
" this their Error, *Job* v. 1. *Call now*, say they, *if*
" *there be any that will answer thee, and unto which*
" *of the Saints wilt thou turn?* — This Doubt
" doth arise from this Error and Mistake, The Af-
" flicted doth without Ground suppose, that express
" Examples of every particular Case of the Saints is
" set down in Scripture. It is true, there are Ex-
" amples of many Cases which may befal the God-
" ly; but it is not to be expected that we shall find
" Examples of every particular Exercise of Mind

" wherein

" wherein the Saints may fall.—Wherefore the Af-
" flicted must walk by Rules set down in Scripture,
" whether they find the Practices thereof in Scri-
" pture, or not."—Thus you see, Mr. *Edwards* hath set aside the Experience of the Saints in Scripture no otherwise than Mr. *Dickson* hath done.—And if it be an Evidence of a Tendency to support Enthusiasm in Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon, it must be an Evidence of the same in Mr. *Dickson*'s Book. I might have brought Quotations from many others to the same Purpose; such as Mr. *Shepherd*, *Fraser*, *Colings*, &c. if it were needful.

What you afterwards say (Reasoning I cannot call it) is nothing to the Purpose, yea, evidently false, from what is already said.—There can be nothing more out of Purpose than your saying, *That we ought to exclude from our Practice and Imitation, every Thing that wants the Authority of Scripture Rule or Example.*—Howsoever this may hold as to what is necessary to be believed and practised for Salvation, yet, are there not innumerable Actions in Life, and Circumstances of Actions, that we have no Scripture Rule, Precept or Example for the doing of them; notwithstanding we do them warrantably, upon this Ground, because they are not excluded by any Scripture-rule or right Reason?—Besides all this, the Question here is not about Practice, but about God's various Ways of working in the Conversion of Sinners, and these bodily Distresses which the Subjects of them cannot help or exclude if they were ever so willing, and wherein they are only the passive Subjects.—It hath never been asserted by judicious Protestants, in their Controversy with the Papists, that the Scripture imitable Example of the Saints is of equal Authority with Scripture-precept, as you say: For Protestants assert, That the Example of the Saints is no further to be imitated, and binding, than it is warranted by Scripture-precept, or the imitable Example of Jesus Christ;

Christ; and, wherein it is not warranted by these, is not to be imitated by us.

Altho' it should be supposed (which is all that Mr. *Edwards* doth, without granting it) that the Effects upon the Bodies of Men, as mentioned by him, are not recorded in Scripture as attending spiritual Experiences of the Saints; it doth not follow that they are contrary to these, as you assert; more than the Variety that there is in the Conviction and Conversion of Scripture-instances, is a Contrariety the one to the other.— The Circumstances of *Paul*'s Conversion were not recorded in the Scriptures then written, as attending the Experiences of the Saints: Were they therefore contrary to Scripture-example, and therefore, as you learnedly argue, excluded by a Scripture-rule? — In the Case of *Stewartoun*, according to you, there are no Instances in the recorded Experiences of the Saints, of any of them, who under a Law-work, fell over, and were carried out of the Church, as the People of *Stewartoun* did: Will you say therefore, that their Case was contrary to the Example of the Saints recorded in Scripture, and so excluded by a Scripture-rule? — If this be the Case of the Persons in question, it must as much be the Case of the People at *Stewartoun*.— What you say next of *our having a plain Scripture-rule, discharging all imaginary Ideas of God*, &c. is granted: But it is not against Mr. *Edwards*, who saith no such Thing, as hath already been clearly proved.

It is surprising, that what you have in the next Paragraph can proceed from a Man pretending to Candor and common Sense.— You say, *That, in the Room of Scripture-pattern in the Experience of the Saints, Mr.* Edwards *sets upon a mechanical, extra-scriptural Example, whereby, he affirms, Persons are greatly affected by seeing others so.*— Here you again grosly misrepresent him: He is so far from setting up the Example of living present Persons, in the Room of Scripture-pattern in the Experience of the Saints, that

that he considers them as different Causes, and in different Views.— The Experience of the Saints in Scripture is considered and spoken of both by you and him as a Pattern; but Example, in the present Case, is considered and spoken of by him expressly in the View of one of these Means God is sometimes pleased to use in convincing and converting Sinners, and in edifying and building up Saints. This he clearly and sufficiently illustrates and confirms, both from Scripture and Reason; all which you have overlooked.— How can you then say, he sets up the one in the room of the other?

What you say in your reasoning is nothing else but a Misrepresentation of Mr. *Edwards'* Meaning, and one Sentence contradicting another.—— You say, *The Example Mr.* Edwards *speaks of, may be of Use in mechanical Things; but, in Things spiritual, it is absolutely absurd: For Faith cometh by Hearing the Word of God, and not by the Example of any Man whatsomever.*— In the very next Sentence you contradict yourself, by saying, *I am not here speaking against the Usefulness of Examples in practical Godliness:* Pray, Sir, Is not practical Godliness among spiritual Things? And did you not in the very foregoing Sentence say, That, in Things spiritual, it is absolutely absurd to say, that Example can be of Use as a Mean? For this is precisely the Point in Hand.— You say, you do not speak against the Usefulness of Example in practical Godliness; and yet you say, Faith comes by Hearing the Word of God, without the Example of any Man whatsomever.— Is not Faith a Branch of practical Godliness, which includes all the Duties of the first Table of the Law?— These are evident Contradictions.—— Further, what you say, That *Faith comes by Hearing the Word of God*, and not by Example, as it is no Reasoning against, so it doth not so much as contradict any Thing Mr. *Edwards* affirms.— For what he saith is expressly, *That the Word of God is the principal Means, by which all*

other

other Means operate and are made effectual, and particularly Example; for all that is visible to the Eye is unintelligible and vain, without the Word of God to instruct and guide the Mind. Lond. Edit. p. 26. *Edinb.* Edit. p. 30.— He acknowledgeth that the Word is the principal outward Mean of producing Faith, *&c.* as much as you can do; and further affirms, that Example is a less principal Mean, and made effectual by the Word. This is what you both affirm and deny.

You proceed to tell us, that the Thing you are speaking against is, *That secret impulse, communicated by the Example of others, whereby a Person is in like Manner affected, even tho' there be not a Word spoken.* Well, be it so; you are at Liberty to speak as much against it as you please, I will not contradict you.—— But you say, *It is of this Mr.* Edwards *speaks, and not of the former, viz.* the Usefulness of Example in practical Godliness.— The very Reverse is Truth:—— He speaks of the former, and not one Word of this as ye have shaped it.— The Passage you quote from Mr. *Edwards* is mangled by you; you give only the Part of a Sentence, and the most material Words even in that Sentence are left out by you.— Because every Reader may not have your *Review*, or, if he have, will not be at the Trouble to compare this Answer with it; I shall first set down the Passage as you give it in your *Review*, p. 19. and opposite to it the Passage fully and fairly as it is in Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon: That the Reader, having both in his View, may see your Unfair-dealing, and that Mr. *Edwards* saith nothing but what is solid and judicious, and not what you affirm he saith.

The Passage, as you unfairly quote it, is	The Passage, as in Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon, is,
Tho' the Impression that is made upon them, should be only by seeing Tokens in the Behaviour of others, without hearing them say one Word.	*'Tis therefore no Argument against the Goodness of the Effect, that one affects and stirs up another, or that Persons are greatly affected by seeing others so; yea,* tho' the Impression that is made upon them should be only by seeing the Tokens *of great and extraordinary Affections* in others in their Behaviour, *taking for granted what they are affected with,* without hearing them say one Word.

Now, doth Mr. *Edwards* say, That an Impulse is communicated by the Example of others, whereby a Person is in like Manner affected, even tho' there be not a Word spoken? — Doth he not say this, The Impression is made upon them by seeing the Tokens *of great and extraordinary Affections* in the Behaviour of others; and that they know and take for granted that they are thus affected with a Sight of their Sin, and the Wrath of God due to them for their Sins; and that they may evidently know that they are thus affected extraordinarily, by outward Tokens of it in their Behaviour, tho' they should not express it by Words? For this he gives a very good Reason, namely, That, in some Cases, what passeth upon our Affections may be more fully and effectually declared by Actions than by Words: All which he proves at great length to be both scriptural and reasonable.— This is what hath frequently happened here. Several have told me, That when they saw, by outward Tokens, the great Agonies, Fears and inward Concern of others; and knew that they were thus affected, from a Sight of their Sins, and Danger thereby; they reaso-

reasoned thus with themselves; If these Persons, who have never been so great Sinners as I know myself to be, are so deeply affected with their sinful and lost Estate; what greater Reason have I? What a hard-hearted Wretch am I? And what will become of me, if I continue unaffected with my Sin and Danger? And, thus reasoning with themselves, they came to be affected by seeing others. Is there any Thing unscriptural or unreasonable here? — As to what you alledge upon Mr. *Edwards*, it is neither more nor less than, *This is exactly the Language of Quakers, a Branch of that hellish Scheme, calculated for enervating and overthrowing the Divine Authority of the Word, as it is the only Foundation of Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.* To this I answer, *first*, It has been proved, that you have falsly quoted Mr. *Edwards'* Words, and misrepresented his Meaning; and therefore, tho' his Words as falsified by you should be exactly the Language of Quakers, it makes nothing against his *true* Words.

2*dly*, When you give the Language of the Quakers, and shew that what Mr. *Edwards* saith here is exactly their Language, you shall be answered; but, from what now appears of your Unfair-dealing with Mens Words, no wise Person will take your *Word* for it.

You conclude this Argument by a Passage of Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon, from which you say, *it plainly appears, that he wants to set aside the Word as the only Rule at least in judging and trying this Work.* The Passage is in your Edition, p. 44. in mine, p. 39. — You leave out some of the principal Clauses, according to your laudable Custom. I shall here set down the Passage as it is in Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon, marking the Words you leave out in a different Character, that the Reader may observe them. — *Whatever Spirit removes our Darkness, and brings us to the Light*; UNDECEIVES US, AND CONVINCES US OF THE TRUTH; *does us a Kindness. If I am brought to a Sight of Truth,*

 and

and am made sensible of Things as they be, my Duty is to thank God for it, without standing first to enquire by what Means I have such a Benefit.—— The Meaning you put upon this (whether according to the Rules of Christian Charity and Truth, let others judge) is, *I am to thank God for such a Benefit, without enquiring whether I have it by the Means of his Word, or by a satanical Imposture: Which is quite contrary to the express Letter of the Text, which Mr.* Edwards *pretends to insist upon; Try the Spirits, whether they are of God.* Whereas the plain Meaning of Mr. *Edwards'* Words is, that if I am UNDECEIVED, AND CONVINCED OF THE TRUTH, brought from Darkness to Light, and made sensible of Things truly as they be (of which he gives Instances, in his Amplification upon this Mark, that Satan neither can nor will bring any to) I may be certain, without any further Enquiry, that this Kindness and Benefit comes to me by the Spirit and Word of Truth, and not by satanical Imposture; and so it is my Duty, without any Hesitation, to thank God for it, seeing the Effects mentioned sufficiently evidence that the Kindness and Benefit are from him.— This will appear plain and evident to every one who will but read what Mr. *Edwards* saith upon his fourth distinguishing Mark of the true Spirit.—— Let the Reader now judge whether it appears by this Passage, that Mr. *Edwards* wants to lay aside the Word, as the only Rule, at least in trying and judging this Work; seeing that in this very Article he gives this Rule from the Word, by which we may know the Operations of the true Spirit, That he leads into Truth, undeceives Persons; and convinceth them of the Truth, *&c.* And further, if you have not failed as much in your third Argument, to prove the Tendency of this Sermon to Enthusiasm, as you have in the former.

What remains is to consider the Strength of your fourth Argument, to prove that this Sermon *tends to overthrow the Foundation of Faith and all practical Godliness, and to establish mere Enthusiasm, and strong*

Delu-

Delusion, in the Room of true Religion revealed and required in the Word. You carry it on thus: *Mr.* Edwards *being aware that this Work cannot stand the Trial of the distinguishing Marks of a saving Work of Grace upon the Soul*; (Who told you this? Mr. *Edwards* neither saith nor insinuateth it.) *He is therefore for stating no special Difference between common and saving Grace, or drawing any dividing Line between Saints and Hypocrites in the present World.* If it please the Reader to look over what Mr. *Edwards* says upon this Subject you refer to, P. 63, 64, 65. Sermon, *Lond.* Edit. or P. 70, 71, 72. *Edinb.* Edit. he will easily see how much you misrepresent Mr. *Edwards.* It contains an Exhortation to the Children of God to beware of judging them to be wicked Men and Hypocrites, who are professing Christians, have the Form of Godliness, and the visible Conversation of godly Men. This he inforceth from the following Considerations, That it is strictly forbidden in Scripture; That it is the sole Prerogative of God; That it is the proper Work and Business of the Day of Judgment, to distinguish Hypocrites, that have the Form of Godliness, and visible Conversation of godly Men, from true Saints. *From all which he infers, These therefore do greatly err, that take it upon them positively to determine who are sincere, and who not; and to draw the dividing Line between true Saints and Hypocrites; and to separate between Sheep and Goats, setting the one on the right Hand, and the other on the left; and to distinguish and gather out the Tares from among the Wheat.*

Is there the least Word, in his handling this Subject, insinuating his being against Ministers stating doctrinally a Difference between common and saving Grace? For what he condemns under the Name of *drawing a dividing Line between true Saints and Hypocrites,* is such a sinful judging Persons of a blameless godly Conversation, in this present World (suppose the Ten Virgins) as to determine and say, This

is

is a wise Virgin, and this is a foolish Virgin; and not at all a doctrinal *stating a Difference between common and saving Grace*, as you would mislead your Readers, by making the one exigetical of the other, as if they were the same Thing in different Words. Wherefore nothing can be more impertinent than what you add, *That it is not the Question, Whether we are to judge Mens Hearts by their Actions? but, Whether Ministers ought not doctrinally to declare, that there is a specifick Difference between common and saving Grace, and between both these and the Delusions of* Satan? *and consequently, Whether they ought not to point out these distinguishing Marks from the Word, and Christians examine themselves thereby, that they may know whether they have Grace in Reality, or the Counterfeit only?* This is what Mr. *Edwards* makes no Question about, what he had nothing to do with in this Place, where his Design is to caution against rash judging and censuring the State of other Men; and it is what he nowhere denies in this Sermon. It would have been fully as much to the Purpose, if you had said, that the Question is, Whether Christ speaking in the Scriptures, or the Pope, be the supreme Judge of Controversies? Allow me further to ask you a Question or two upon your saying, *No reasonable Man ever pretended to judge of Mens Hearts, otherwise than by their outward Actions.* How come you to judge Numbers of Persons, whose outward Conversation and Actions are like these of the Saints and Godly, to be the Children of the Devil, to be Hypocrites, and under a Delusion? Do you not by this condemn yourself, and act both unreasonably and unchristianly? Consider, my dear Sir, the strong and solid Things Mr. *Edwards* saith against this sinful Judging and Censuring, forgetting for once who saith it.

After you have affirmed, that it is the Duty of Ministers to give distinguishing Marks of saving Grace, and of People to try themselves by them; you add next

next Paragraph, as gravely as if you were telling a certain Truth, *But Mr.* Edwards *is against such a narrow and strict Search.* The Proof you give of this is, *That the positive Marks of the true Spirit, which he gives* (summ'd up P. 50. *Lond.* Edit. P. 56. *Edinb.* Edit.) *are noway distinguishing; they are such as may agree not only with the common Influences of the Spirit, but even with the Delusions of* Satan. In answer, *First*, If this were as you say, it will not prove that Mr. *Edwards* is against Ministers giving distinguishing Marks of Grace, and Peoples trying themselves by them. For some Ministers, who have not been against this, have given insufficient Marks of Grace, thro' Ignorance, Mistake, Inadvertency or Prejudice. Of this your own dear Self is an Instance. Among the distinguishing Marks of Grace you give, *Review*, P. 21. there is one, which seems to be your favourite distinguishing Mark, by your repeating it so often, which is far from being a sufficient one, namely, *Contending for present Truth, in Opposition to the Indifferency and Neutrality of the World.* This may agree not only with the common Influences of the Spirit, but with the Delusions of *Satan*: For the Apostle *Paul* supposeth, that Men may contend further for present Truth than you, or any of your Party, have done, even to the giving their Bodies to be burnt, and yet be Hypocrites, 1 *Cor.* xiii. 3. Doth it follow from this, that you are against Ministers giving, and Christians trying themselves by, distinguishing Marks of Grace? If it do not, as little doth it follow from Mr. *Edwards'* giving insufficient Marks, allowing this to be really the Case. But, 2*dly*, It is far from being so: For the positive distinguishing Marks of the true Spirit given by Mr. *Edwards*, none of them agree with the Delusions of *Satan*, but are each of them distinguishing of the Influences of the good Spirit, from that of the evil Spirit. And you have not so much as essayed to give any other Proof of the contrary, than your bare Word. If this be

suffici-

ſufficient, let the Reader judge. As to their Agreement with the common Influences of the Spirit, ſome of them do, and ſome of them are diſtinguiſhing Marks of the ſaving Operations of the Spirit. As to theſe, the Degree of which agreeth only to the common Influences of the Spirit, they are as much diſtinguiſhing Marks of the true Spirit as the other are.

You cannot ſpeak of Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon, even in theſe Things that are of leaſt Conſequence to the principal Queſtion, without miſrepreſenting him. You ſay, That *he pretends to have made a full Enumeration of the Marks of the true Spirit, from the Writings of the Apoſtle* John. It is ſo far from this, that he expreſly ſaith, *Lond.* Edit. P. 33. *Edinb.* Edit. P. 38. *And in this, as I ſaid before, I ſhall confine myſelf wholly to thoſe Marks which are given us by the Apoſtle in the Chapter wherein is my Text.* But, ſay you, *Mr.* Edwards *ſaith, They are ſufficient to determine this Work to be the Work of the Spirit of God.* He ſaith ſo indeed, and proveth it likewiſe. Is this a pretending to have made a full Enumeration? *&c.* May they not be ſufficient to determine this Work to be the Work of the Spirit of God, tho' there be not a full Enumeration of all the Marks contained in the whole Writings of *John* and other holy Scriptures? The beloved Diſciple thought them ſufficient.

You ſay, *It will be obvious to any intelligent Chriſtian, that a Perſon may have all the Marks he condeſcends upon, as he treats them, and yet be under a groſs Deluſion.*—I anſwer, That Mr. *Edwards* doth not pretend to give Marks of a Perſon in a State of Grace; but of the true Spirit, and his Influences and Operations: And therefore what you ſpeak here of Marks of Grace in a Perſon, of which you inſtance ſeveral you pretend he doth not touch, is a changing the State of the Queſtion, and not to the Purpoſe.—But, 2*dly*, To meet with you upon your own Terms, there are ſome of theſe Marks, which if a Perſon have them, he cannot be under a Deluſion,

ſion, if he judge himſelf thereby to be in a State of Grace, if we may depend upon what the Apoſtle *John* ſaith: Particularly the two Branches of the 5th diſtinguiſhing Mark of the true Spirit, namely, Love to God, and Love to the Brethren, 1 *John* iv. 7. *Love is of God, and he that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God*, &c. to the End of the Chapter. And, Chap. iii. 14. *We know that we have paſſed from Death to Life, becauſe we love the Brethren.* 3*dly*, As to the Marks of Grace you enumerate, which you ſay Mr. *Edwards* toucheth not, they are all included in the poſitive Marks of the true Spirit, excepting that which I have already ſhewed to be inſufficient; namely, your firſt is included in the firſt diſtinguiſhing Mark of the true Spirit, your ſecond in his ſecond, your third in his third, and your fourth in his fifth: But, if they were not, it would make nothing againſt Mr. *Edwards*; ſeeing, if a Perſon knoweth his State by one or two ſufficient Marks, he may know that he hath all the reſt, tho' he cannot diſcern them. I queſtion if, in every Sermon wherein you give Marks of a State of Grace, you think yourſelf bound to give all the Marks of it that are. Mr. *Guthrie*, in his *Trial of a ſaving Intereſt in Chriſt*, contents himſelf with very few, judging them ſufficient.

It ſeems to have ſtared you in the Face, that you were miſrepreſenting Mr. *Edwards*, when you raiſe this Objection againſt what you had obſerved; *If it be ſaid for Mr.* Edwards, *that he is giving the Marks of a Divine Influence of the Spirit of God in Oppoſition to a Diabolical Influence or Deluſion*; — which is indeed the Caſe.— As to what you ſay upon this, that he lays down no Marks of Diſtinction between a a common Operation of the Spirit, and a Deluſion of *Satan*; — The contrary is evident from his poſitive Marks.— It is aſtoniſhing to obſerve what followeth; *That granting this Work were the Effect of a common Operation of the Spirit, yet, if it goes no fur-*

 ther

ther, Persons will be as effectually ruined in the Issue as they could be by satanical Imposture.— Is this a mere Inaccuracy? Or, if not, what do you mean? — Are the common Operations of the Spirit, tho' they go no further, Cause of Ruin to any, as satanical Imposture is? Is not the common Operation of the Spirit a great Benefit and Fruit of the rich Goodness of God to a Person himself, tho' it go no further? — Is it not an Advantage to a Society of which such a Person is a Member? — Is not satanical Imposture always a Judgment? — Is it no Advantage to be less a Sinner, to be in some Degree reformed, and, if a Person shall be ruined in the Issue, to want many Degrees of Guilt they would otherwise have had? — Will you preach, If Men will not become real Christians, they had as good go to Hell like a *Nero*, as like the young Man Christ loved, who yet, so far as appears to us, perished in Sin? — I refer you to your Presbytery's Censure.

In the next Paragraph, p. 22. you say, *It is obvious from the whole Tenor of the Discourse, that it is so laid as to make People believe that he is giving the Marks of a saving Operation of the Spirit of God upon the Souls of Men.*— And so he doth, as also of the common Operations of the Spirit.— But then, *my dear Brother*, if this be obvious from the whole Tenor of his Discourse, how could you say so confidently in this Argument, that Mr. *Edwards* is against such a narrow and strict Search as by the Marks of a saving Operation of the Spirit, and against Ministers giving Marks of Grace, or Peoples trying themselves by them? Reconcile this Contradiction.

It fills me with Amazement to think, that you have not had more Regard to your own Character than to affirm of Mr. *Edwards*, and all the Writers on that Side, especially the Clergy, that they copy after his Example; *declaring them to he guilty of the unpardonable Sin against the Holy Ghost, who speak a WORD against this Work.* He and others whom you call the

Clergy

Clergy (I am surprised you use this unhallowed Popish *English* Term) have indeed cautioned against Mens calling this Work of the Spirit of God the Work of the Devil, lest they may be left of God to do it in such Circumstances as incur the Guilt of this dreadful Sin.— But does he or any other Writer *declare them to be guilty of the unpardonable Sin, who speak a Word against it?* Nay, Mr. *Edwards* is so far from this in the very Place you cite, *Edinb.* Edit. p. 63. *Lond.* Edit. p. 57. that he says, "Those that maliciously "oppose and reproach this Work, and call it the "Work of the Devil, want but one Thing of the "unpardonable Sin, and that is doing it against in-"ward Conviction." Whence it is evident, Mr. *Edwards* plainly owns upon the Matter, that People may oppose this Work, may even maliciously oppose and reproach it, and not be guilty of the unpardonable Sin, against the Holy Ghost.—And yet, *Dear Sir*, you have not been afraid to tell the World,—— that Mr. *Edwards* charges them as guilty of the unpardonable Sin who speak a WORD against it. When will you have done with *Misrepresentations* and *Calumnies?*

You add, *They who know their God, will not be so easily beat out of their Reason and Religion by big Words.*— Alas! let the World judge whether there be either Reason or Religion in this Part of your *Review* that concerns Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon, or any Evidence of the Knowledge of God.

You lose your Labour in endeavouring to prove from the Reverend Mr. *Willison*'s Preface, That Mr. *Edwards* gives distinguishing Marks of the Influences of the true Spirit, both common and saving; for it is not controverted.— You say, *After all Mr.* Edwards' *positive Marks, none of them serve to prove this Work to be the Effect of Divine Influence; for they may be found every one of them in a Person that is under a Delusion of Satan.*— This you should have proved; This is what you will never be able to do.— I have already proved from Scripture the contrary.— What you

you ſay of Mr. *Guthrie*, *Shepherd* and *Burgeſs*, ſhall be conſidered when you condeſcend upon Particulars.

From what hath been ſaid in this Letter, it now, I hope, evidently appears, that Mr. *Edwards'* Sermon is not calculated for ſupporting Enthuſiaſm, and conſequently for razing the very Foundation of Faith, and all practical Godlineſs; — It evidently appears, that you have brought a falſe Charge of this againſt it, and have failed in your Proof: — In fine, it evidently appears, that the Reverend Mr. *Williſon*, whoſe Works praiſe him, hath done no raſh Thing, but good Service to the Intereſts of Religion, in recommending it to the *Scots* Reader.

Give me leave to conclude this Letter to you, *Dear Sir*, with obſerving, that you might have ſeen many expreſs, ſtrong Obſervations in this Sermon contrary to all Enthuſiaſm; which warrant what the Reverend Mr. *Cooper* ſaith in his Preface to it, *And I believe every candid, judicious Reader will ſay, He writes very free from an Enthuſiaſtick or a Party Spirit.* Particularly, p. 15. *And here I would obſerve, that we are to take the Scriptures to be our Guide in ſuch Caſes: This is the great and ſtanding Rule, that God has given to his Church, to guide them in all Things relating to the great Concerns of their Souls; and it is an infallible and ſufficient Rule.* — See his frequent Cautions about Impulſes, — and what he ſaith about Inſpirations. — Your Eſſay then to prove it calculated to eſtabliſh Enthuſiaſm could not but be vain, as hath been made evident by him, whoſe Prayers you have for you, and who is,

Dear Brother,

Kilſyth, Dec. 1. 1742.

Your's, &c.